



SN 10/372,422

Deborah Muse Carty
20 Stelton Road, Suite #1
Piscataway, NJ 08854
Pro Se

In re Patent Application
of Deborah Muse Carty
Serial No. 10/803,624

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**For: *Clothing Hanger Adapted for
Personal Use***

Art Unit: 3765

Filing Date: 03/18/04

The Honorable Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Mail Stop: Fee Amendments
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDMENT A WITH PETITION AND FEE FOR THREE MONTH
EXTENSION TO FILE**

a. Introductory comments.

This is a plenary amendment in response to a non-final Office Action dated June 15, 2006 and allowing a three month period for response without an extension petition and applicable fee. Based on telephone conversations with the Examiner, applicant is amending the application to cancel all claims and add new claim 11 reciting a structure and new method claim 12 reciting a method for using the structure reciting in claim 11. The specification and drawing were objected to for failing to recite reference numerals appearing in the drawings but not recited in the specification. Thus, the applicable specification paragraphs have been proposed for amendment to resolve these objections. More specifically, it is requested that the specification be amended to add the following reference characters in the description: 10, 14, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to officially notice that the inventor is a pro se applicant representing herself and the application is not assigned. The inventor understands that the USPTO has an official policy that where a pro se inventor files a specification that describes patentable subject matter that includes an element not anticipated and nonobvious the Examiner may write and suggest an allowable claim to the novel invention described in the specification. Thus, the applicant hereby respectfully request that the Examiner suggest such a claim. Alternatively, it is believed that new claims 11, 12, and 13 are neither anticipated nor suggested by the prior cited, namely, Banco in view of Lam.

The other prior art of interest cited by the Examiner has been carefully reviewed. None of these patents either taken singly or in combination suggest the novelty of the

combination of elements recited in new claims 11 and 13, and use of the structure presented by the inventor in claim 11.

If any of the new claims are not in proper form, as a pro se applicant, applicant requests that the Examiner in accordance with the Patent Office's procedures suggest a rewrite to reflect an allowable claim or claims.

The thorough search done by the Examiner and explanation of the rejection based on the new patents and how they were applied to the cancelled claims is very much appreciated by the inventor.